



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

With reference to the meaning of these prepositions and the period during which they were in use, Meyer-Lübke says: ³ "Il est à remarquer qu'en vieux français notamment *atout* et *otout*, de *apud totu*, sont employés entièrement au sens du simple *ad*: *il s'en vaut atout moi fuir* (Chev. II esp. 7313) et de même encore au XVI^e siècle,⁴ en partie jusqu'à nos jours dans les patois,⁵ spécialement avec un régime instrumental."

The history of *a tot* (*atot*) and *otot* is the same as that of *poruec* (*pruec*) and *avuec*, with reference to which Gaston Paris says: ⁶ "Or il est arrivé à *poruec*, *pruec*, la même chose qu'à *avuec*. On a perdu de vue la valeur de la seconde partie du mot, qui en faisait nécessairement un adverbe,⁷ et on en a fait une préposition,⁸ ayant à peu près le sens du simple *por*, comme *avuec* a pris par l'usage le sens de *od*."

OLIVER M. JOHNSTON.

Leland Stanford Jr. University.

ON THE SOURCES OF THE *FATA APOSTOLORUM*

Although many attempts have been made to determine the source of Cynewulf's *Fata Apostolorum*, none has been wholly successful. Sarrazin (*Anglia* XII, 380 ff.) was the first to point out that Cynewulf might have found all his material in a martyrology which must have been nearly related to that of Jerome and the one known to Venantius. He thinks it probable that the source is the lost *Liber passionum duodecim apostolorum* which Bede used as the basis of his martyrology, and notes further that the content of the *Breviarium Apostolorum* as given by Lipsius agrees closely with the *Fata*. Since the former text was not accessible, he confined himself to a comparison with Bede from which he concludes

quant et (Norm.), à *tout quant et mei* (arr. de S. Brieuc). A Alençon on dit *aquatele moi*."

³ See *op. cit.*, III, § 444.

⁴ For examples of *atout* in the sixteenth century, compare Darmesteter and Hatzfeld, *Le Seizième Siècle en France*, Paris, 1889, p. 274.

⁵ See D. Behrens, *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie*, XIII, 410-11.

⁶ See *Romania*, VI, 589.

⁷ *Jo irai pruec e tu chi atendras* (*Alisc.* 3748).

⁸ *Alés pruekes le parkemin* (*Le Dit de l'Empeur Coustant*, 397).

that Bede and Cynewulf used the same source (p. 381). Holt-hausen reaches a different conclusion, namely that Cynewulf used a Latin text which was a combination of Bede and the *Breviarium* but which had added a few facts from the legends of the individual apostles.¹ Bourauel² adds to the two sources proposed by Sarrazin and Holthausen: Jerome, *Notitia de locis apostolorum*, and Isidore, *De vita et obitu utriusque testamenti sanctorum*. After comparing the *Fata* with these four texts,³ he concludes that Cynewulf certainly used Isidore, Bede and the notes of Jerome, and probably the *Breviarium Apostolorum* and Παράξεις Θωμᾶ; and that all the sources were Latin with the possible exception of the account of Thomas. Krapp,⁴ after comparing these same four texts, concludes that Cynewulf had before him the list or lists which Bede used in his martyrology, since all the incidents of the *Fata* might have been derived from Bede with the exception of the account of the death of James, son of Zebedee, which agrees with that of the *Breviarium*, and the awakening of Gad, which is found in neither.

A difficulty in accepting Krapp's conclusion lies in the fact that there are three more points, not mentioned by him, which Cynewulf has in common with the *Breviarium*, but which are lacking in Bede. These are the following: that Philip was crucified; Thomas "lanceis transfixus"; and that Bartholomew was "in Albano." Furthermore all of the facts which are found in Cynewulf and the *Breviarium* and not in Bede are found also in Isidore, who agrees almost verbatim with the *Breviarium* throughout, adding or elaborating slightly occasionally. They cannot, then, be considered two sources, and since we know that Isidore was widely known, it seems probable that Cynewulf used Bede (or Bede's sources?) and Isidore for his *Fata*.

Were it not for the story of Gad, which Cynewulf relates in connection with Thomas, we should now be satisfied, but neither Bede nor Isidore makes any mention of this legend. Bourauel (p. 105) and Krapp both accept as fairly satisfactory Sarrazin's statement (p. 382), that the story of Gad may have been in the common

¹ *Herrig's Archiv*, vol. 106, p. 344.

² *Bonner Beiträge*, vol. 11, p. 119.

³ The edition of Bede's *Martyrology* quoted by Bourauel is the *coloniensis*, printed by Migne, *Patrologia*, vol. 94, col. 797, ff. Migne prints also the *editio bollandiana* but this is of little value for the present discussion, being very brief.

⁴ *Andreas and Fata*, Int., p. xxxii.

source of Bede and Cynewulf, and merely omitted by Bede, or that Cynewulf added the legend from some other source. Light is thrown on the question by the great English breviaries—York, Sarum and Hereford—which have not heretofore been considered in this connection. A garbled version of the story is found in the thirteenth century manuscript of the Hereford Chapter Library,⁵ and the whole story, agreeing almost verbatim with the account of the York Breviary, where it is also found,⁶ occurs in the fifteenth century small Hereford Breviary of Worcester.⁷ Though the Hereford Breviary agrees in general with that of Sarum, in certain points it agrees with York rather than with Sarum. Thus, in portions of the lessons for James, son of Zebedee, and Matthew, and notably in the story of Gad.

It is significant that the story occurs in the two northernmost breviaries since Cynewulf lived in the north. We know that the Irish missionaries were active in the region of Yorkshire, and that the Gallican Rite was used there at least up to the time of the Synod of Whitby. Brightman says,⁸ "The Gallican Rite must have continued for a while after the Synod of Whitby by English disciples of St. Colman and only gradually have given place to the Roman, possibly leaving behind it traces like those which later on were left by the Gallican Rite on the continent after it had been gradually superseded by the Roman." In the *Breviarium Gothicum*⁹ we find the story with close verbal resemblance in many points to that of York and Hereford, and the Mozarabic Liturgy¹⁰ has the story also, though Gad occurs there as Bat(!). There seems strong likelihood, then, that the *Fata* goes back to an Irish-Latin tradition, current in Northern England. Dr. Carleton Brown (*Eng. St.* XL, 1-30) has already pointed out that Cynewulf shows Irish-Latin influence, and one of the proper names which he adduces in proof of his point occurs in the Asseum of the *Fata*. This may serve to strengthen the likelihood of the above assumption concerning the source of the *Fata*.

RUTH PERKINS.

Bryn Mawr College.

⁵ *Hereford Breviary*, vol. 2, p. 73, Henry Bradshaw Society Publications, vol. 40.

⁶ *York Breviary*, vol. 2, col. 124-126, Surtees Society, 1882.

⁷ *Hereford Breviary*, pp. 72-4.

⁸ *The English Rite*, Int., p. xiv.

⁹ Migne, *Patrologia*, vol. 86, col. 1302.

¹⁰ Migne, *Patrologia*, vol. 85, col. 181.